

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-23 and 25-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended herein to cure certain informalities. It is further noted that this amendment does not necessitate a new search or any undue effort by the Examiner as it does not present new claimed subject matter. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6 and 8 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to cure certain informalities, and in light of this amendment, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 9, 11-14, 17-19, 27 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 9, 11-14, 17-19, 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng *et al.* (U.S. 2003/0210106). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every aspect of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Independent Claims 1 and 19 (and corresponding dependent claims):

The subject application relates to a charging system for energy storage components of portable units. More specifically, independent claims 1 and 19 recite similar limitations, namely *a controller that determines a first charging time for a portable computing device and*

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

allocates a second charging time to the portable computing device. Cheng *et al.* is silent with regard to such novel features.

Cheng *et al.* relates to a system and method for transferring power to devices in a contact-less fashion. On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly contends that Cheng *et al.* discloses a controller that determines a first charging time and allocates a second charging time for a portable computing device. Cheng *et al.* discloses a control unit that functions to maintain the resonance of the circuitry of the primary unit and the orientation of coils within the primary unit used to generate current. (See *e.g.*, ¶[0081] and ¶[0163]). The Examiner's contention that the control unit controls the charging time of secondary devices within the system is misguided. The control unit, and the current-sensing components contained therein, detects the current draw from secondary devices so that the "desired effect" of charging secondary devices can be performed if they are present. (See *e.g.*, ¶[0209]). The control unit simply determines whether additional components (*e.g.*, capacitors) need to be added to the circuitry to maintain a level of resonance because of the presence of one or more secondary devices. However, such disclosure does not equate to either *determining* or *allocating charging times* since the system of Cheng *et al.* is simply modifying the behavior of the primary, charger device to accommodate secondary devices.

Moreover, the Examiner's assertion that driving each coil for different periods of time equates to charging devices at different times is misguided. The reference discloses that one or two coils may be used to increase the active area of the coils, which allows the secondary device to charge while placed in different orientations. (See *e.g.*, ¶ [0214]). The reference further discloses that activating different coils at different times simply changes the active area so that secondary devices can receive a charge from the primary device regardless of their orientation (See *e.g.*, ¶[0160]-[0163]). Thus, it is clear that the system disclosed by Cheng *et al.* does not *determine or allocate charging times*, but rather enables the charger device to be more flexible with respect to the orientation of the secondary devices. Accordingly, it is apparent that the reference is silent with regard to *a controller that determines a first charging time for the portable computing device and allocates a second charging time to the portable computing device*, as claimed. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

Independent Claims 9 and 29 (and corresponding dependent claims):

Independent claims 9 and 29 recite similar limitations, namely *allocating a charge time to charge a rechargeable power supply of the portable unit*. Cheng *et al.* is silent with regard to such novel aspects of the claimed invention.

As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* does not disclose that the system *allocates charge times* to individual devices that require charging. Rather, Cheng *et al.* discloses that secondary devices may be placed upon the primary, charger device to begin charging (See paragraph 0088). The reference makes no mention of the charger system *allocating charge times* to secondary devices for charging, as the system charges secondary devices whenever they are within the active area and aligned properly so that the charger can induce a current in the secondary device (See *e.g.*, ¶[0039]). Thus, the system disclosed in the reference will charge a secondary device provided that it is proximal to the charger, unlike the claimed invention, which provides for *allocating charge times* to portable units that need charging such that each device receives a different charge time. Therefore, it is readily apparent that Cheng *et al.* is silent with regard to *allocating a charge time to charge a rechargeable power supply of the portable unit*.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is evident that Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claims 1, 9, 19, and 29 (and claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10-18, 20-23, and 25-28, which depend there from). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Kaite *et al.* (U.S. 6,016,046). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1. In addition, Kaite *et al.* relates to a battery pack containing rechargeable batteries and a charger device associated therewith and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.*

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

in view of Kaite *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Ishii *et al.* (U.S. 5,070,293). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claim 1 (and therefore claim 2, which depends there from), and Kaite *et al.* fails to make up for the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* Ishii *et al.* relates to a device that transmits electric energy from one coil to another coil using an inductive coupling and does not make up for the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* and Kaite *et al.* Based on at least the foregoing, this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Kaite *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Burton *et al.* (U.S. 6,917,182). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations of independent claim 1 (and claim 3 that depends there from), and Kaite *et al.* and Burton *et al.* fail to make up for these deficiencies. As discussed *supra*, Kaite *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* Furthermore, Burton *et al.* relates to a charging system that controls the charging of a device by varying the current supplied to the inductive coils of the charging system, yet the reference does not teach or suggest determining when a power supply needs to be recharged, as recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 4, 8 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4, 8 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Kaite *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Kodama (U.S. 5,805,998). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claims 1 and 19 (and claims 4, 8, and 26, which respectively depend there from), and Kaite *et al.* and Kodama fail to compensate for such deficiencies. As discussed previously, Kaite *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.*, and Kodama relates to a cordless telephone system and amplifying a voice signal transmitted between a telephone line and radio transceiver. As such,

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

Kodama does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

VII. Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Goto (U.S. 5,600,225). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claim 9 (and claim 10, which depends there from), and Goto fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies. Goto relates to recharging a battery without directly contacting the battery and generating a halting signal to halt the supply of AC power to a primary coil of the system and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 15, 16 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15, 16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Lew *et al.* (U.S. 6,608,464). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 9 and 19 (and claims 15, 16, and 22, which depend there from, respectively). Lew *et al.* relates to solar cells laminated onto a substrate that functions as a power source and does not make up for the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

IX. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Fernandez *et al.* (U.S. 6,184,651). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claim 19 (and claim 20, which depends there from), and Fernandez *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies. This rejection should be withdrawn.

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

X. Rejection of Claims 21 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Kaite *et al.* This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach each and every aspect as set forth in independent claim 19 (and thus claims 21 and 23, which depend there from), and Kaite *et al.* does not make up for such deficiencies. As discussed *supra*, Kaite *et al.* relates to a charger device that charges a battery pack of rechargeable batteries without physically contacting the battery pack. The reference does not, however, make up for the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.*, as discussed previously. Therefore, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XI. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Lappi *et al.* (U.S. 6,114,832). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 19 (and therefore claim 25, which depends there from), and Lappi *et al.* fails to make up for such deficiencies. Lappi *et al.* relates to a charging system for a heart rate measurement system and does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

XII. Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng *et al.* in view of Lappi *et al.* as applied to claim 25 above and in further view of Utsumomiya *et al.* (U.S. 6,327,127). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of independent claim 19 (and therefore claim 28, which depends there from), and Lappi *et al.* and Utsumomiya *et al.* do not make up for the deficiencies of Cheng *et al.* As discussed *supra*, Cheng *et al.* and Lappi *et al.* do not teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims, and Utsumomiya *et al.*, which relates to maintaining a specified voltage level, does not compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

10/733,221

1166/SYMBP167US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [SYMBP167US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731